




MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE BASELINE SEDIMENT CHARACTERIZATION STUDY



March 2001

MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE BASELINE SEDIMENT

CHARACTERIZATION STUDY

Portland District

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

FINAL REPORT

By Laura Hamilton, Environmental Engineer

MARCH 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Pag</u>	<u>e</u>
Introduction	1
Baseline Sediment Quality Studies	1
Sediment Quality Parameters	5
Physical Baseline:	
Physical Analyses	5
1. September 1, 2000 Data	
2. Comparison of Sediment Characteristics Over Time	6
A. Sample 40 and 35	7
B. Samples 41 and 17/56	
C. Samples 68 and 47	7
Chemical Baseline:	
September 1, 2000 Data	
1. Metals	8
2. Phenols	
3. Pesticides and PCBs	
4. Low Polynuclear Aromatic hydrocarbons (LPAH)	
5. High Polynuclear Aromatic hydrocarbons (HPAH)	
6. Chlorinated Hydrocarbons	
7. Miscellaneous Extractables	
8. Phthalate Compounds	
Bibliography	10

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	age
Table 1: Summary of Studies at the Deep Water Site	4
Table 2: Physical Analyses11-	
Table 3: Total Metals analyses of Sediments	14
Table 4: Phenols Compounds Analyses	15
Table 5: Pesticides and PCBs Analyses	16
Table 6: Low Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons Analyses	17
Table 7: High Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons Analyses	18
Table 8: Chlorinated Hydrocarbons Analyses	19
Table 9: Miscellaneous Extractables Analyses	20
Table 10: Phthalates Analyses	21
List of Figures	
Figure Pa	<u>ge</u>
Figure 1: Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Sites for the Columbia River	22
Figure 2: All samples taken from 1974 to 2000	23
Figure 3: September 1, 2000 Sampling	
Figure 4: Select Stations from the 1997-98 SW Washington Inner	25
Continental Shelf Sidescan-sonar study.	
Figure 5: Select Stations from the Oct./Nov. 1995 and June 1996 Samplings	26
Figure 6: Select Stations from the July 1993 and August 1994 Samplings	27
Figure 7: Select Stations from the July 1992 Samplings	
Figure 8: Tongue Point Monitoring Program from 1989-1992	29
Figure 9: Select Stations from the 1974-1976 Aquatic Disposal Field	30
Investigations of Columbia River Disposal Site	
Figure 10: Percent Fines vs. Depth	
Figure 11: Mean Grain Size vs. Depth	32
Figure 12: Median Grain Size vs. Depth	
Figure 13: Fines Contours for the Columbia River ODMDS	34

MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE BASELINE SEDIMENT CHARACTERIZATION STUDY

INTRODUCTION:

Sediment and water quality analyses of ocean dredge material disposal sites (ODMDS) are required to adequately address general criterion (b) and specific factors 4, 9, and 10 of 40 CFR 228.5 and 228.6. The lack of adequate baseline data for the MCR Deep Water Site was noted in Appendix H, Volume I: Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Sites Main Report and Technical Exhibits Integrated Feasibility Report for Channel Improvements and Environmental Impact Statement, Columbia and Lower Willamette River Federal Navigation Channel (USACE, 8/99), pg H-5. To supply this lack, ten samples were collected on September 12, 2000 in the Deep Water Site and physical and chemical analyses are performed to establish baseline conditions. Using these analyses, this report provides the baseline conditions for the MCR Deep Water Site, which is being considered as a possible ODMDS site for Columbia River dredge materials. The sediment and water quality analyses of the proposed dredge material are not addressed in this report, since this information is available in other studies.

The Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA) require that five general criteria and eleven specific factors be addressed during the designation process (40CFR 228.5 and 228.6). These criteria and factors have been interpreted as 27 different "areas of consideration" that cover the proposed ODMDS site and the dredged material it receives. These areas of consideration are listed in an ODMDS conflict matrix, which is used to evaluate each candidate site on its compliance with the requirements for disposal site designation. The conflict matrix is listed in Tables 4-12 of Appendix H of the Integrated Feasibility Report for Channel Improvements and Environmental Impact Statement, Columbia and Lower Willamette River (USACE, 8/99), pg H45-55. The results of the candidate ODMDS conflict matrixes are compared with each other, and are used to select the best ODMDS. The areas of consideration involving sediment quality in this study are:

- 1. Physical and chemical sediment compatibility,
- 2. Water column chemistry and physical characteristics,
- 3. Influence of past disposal,
- 4. Degraded areas
- 5. Potential for Cumulative Effects

No past disposal of dredge material has occurred within the boundaries of the Deep Water Site. No degraded areas were identified. No impacts due to sediment quality are expected. Dredged material is expected to mound. This report will discuss the physical and chemical sediment compatibility, and water column chemistry and physical characteristics.

BASELINE SEDIMENT QUALITY STUDIES:

The baseline sediment quality data for the MCR Deep Water Site was collected from seven studies offshore of the Mouth of the Columbia River area spanning from 1974 to September 2000. All seven studies covered various locations offshore, such as ODMDS

Areas A, B, E, F and Southwestern Washington Inner Continental Shelf.

The September 1, 2000 sampling event was conducted specifically to establish baseline physical and chemical conditions at the MCR Deep Water Site. There were ten sample stations strategically located across the Deep Water Site to gain the best coverage of the site, as shown on Figure 3. The samples were tested for all Tier II analyses as defined by the Dredged Material Evaluation Framework (DMEF) (USACE, 1998). The DMEF manual defines the Tier II testing to include physical sediment analysis, and chemical analysis for metals; organometallic compounds; and organics. The organic analyses include chlorinated hydrocarbons, phthalates; phenols; pesticides; polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs); miscellaneous extractables; and other organics. The September 1, 2000 samples' physical and chemical analyses are shown on Tables 2 through 10.

The October/November 1995 and June 1996 studies were conducted to identify the benthic infauna and sediment characteristics offshore from the Columbia River (Hinton, S., 1998). There were a total of 39 stations, each sampled twice for physical analyses and biological analyses.

The August 1994 and July 1993 studies were conducted to identify the benthic infauna and sediment characteristics offshore from the Columbia River (Hinton, S., 1996) There were a total of 30 stations, each sampled twice for physical analyses and biological analyses.

The Tongue Point 1989 – 1992 monitoring program study (Siipola, M, R., 1993) supports these conclusions. The Tongue Point study was performed to assess environmental impacts of disposing dissimilar sediments to the coarser ambient sediments at disposal site F. As shown on Figure 1, disposal site F is very close to the Deep Water Site. The Tongue Point samples at Site F were collected over four years at depths ranging from 147 to 168 ft. All samples showed a low percent fines, TOC, and metals. There were no concentrations above the detection limit for phenols, LPAHs, HPAHs, and phthalates. These results correspond to the results from the six September 1, 2000 samples that were taken at similar depths.

The July 1992 study (Siipola, M, 1992) that the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) conducted also supports these conclusions. The July 992 USACE/NMFS study was conducted to identify benthic invertebrate and sediment characteristics over a large area offshore of the Columbia River. Sample 40 was taken at a depth of 255 ft and had higher percent fines (15.6%) and TOC (2.2%), with corresponding higher concentrations of copper (8.9 ppm) than the other July 1992 samples.

The earliest and most extensive sampling event was the 1974-1976 Aquatic Disposal Field Investigations of the Columbia River Disposal conducted as part of the US Army Engineers Dredged Material Research Program (Holton, R. 1978). This study was performed as part of a comprehensive nationwide study to provide more definitive information on the environmental impact of dredging and dredge material disposal operations and to develop new or improved dredged material disposal practices. This multidisciplinary study also was to characterize the baseline physical, chemical, and

biological aspects of the nearshore zone. According to Table C-IA from Appendix C of the study, a total of 391 stations were sampled during the field study. Samples were collected at each station and analyzed for physical analyses of the sediments, chemical analyses of the water column and biological analyses.

A summary of tests results for the seven studies are shown on Tables 2 through 10 and will be discussed in the following section. Figures 1 shows a general overview of the MCR ODMDS disposal sites. Figure 2 shows the sample locations for various studies at or near MCR ODMDSs. Figures 3-9 show the sampling station locations for the seven individual studies with stations in or near the Deep Water Site. Basic information about these studies and their maps are listed in summary Table 1 shown below.

TABLE 1 SUMMARY OF STUDIES AT THE DEEP WATER SITE

DATE	SAMPLE NAMES in this report	TOTAL # OF SAMPLES	WHO PERFORMED	NAME OF REPORT	MAP
9/1/00	89, 97-100, 102, 110, 133-4, 136	10	USACE	This report.	Figure 3
1997-8	67-8; 46	Attempted 100 stations, but obtained only 95.	USGS; WDOE	Sidescan-sonar Surface Sidement Samples, and Surficial Geologic Interpretation of the SW WA. Inner Continental Shelf Based on Data Collected During Corliss Cruises 97007 and 98014	Figure 4
6/96	32-36	39	USACE and NMFS	Benthic infauna and Sediment Characteristics offshore from the Columbia River, Oct/Nov. 1995 and June 1996 by NMFS. There is additional data is in the raw data file.	Figure 5
10-11/95	32-36	39	USACE and NMFS	Benthic infauna and Sediment Characteristics offshore from the Columbia River, Oct/Nov. 1995 and June 1996 by NMFS. There is additional data is in the raw data file.	Figure 5
8/94	52-60; A4 A7& B2	30	USACE and NMFS	Benthic Infauna and Sediment Characteristics offshore from the Columbia River, Aug. 1994 By NMFS. There is additional data is in the raw data file.	Figure 6
7/93	52-60; A4 A7& B2	30	USACE and NMFS	Benthic Infauna and Sediment Characteristics offshore from the Columbia River, Aug. 1994 By NMFS. There is additional data is in the raw data file.	Figure 6
7/92	40-42, 44-46	50	USACE and USEPA	Reconnaissance Level Benthic Infaunal, Sediment, and Fish Study offshore of the Columbia River, July, 1992	Figure 7
1989-92	A1, A4, A7; B2, B3, B5 and B6	29	USACE and NMFS	Tongue Point Monitoring Program 1989-1992 Final Report	Figure 8
1974-76	12-19, 47, 54-56, 69-70	391*	USACE – Waterways Experiment Station	Aquatic Disposal Field Investigations Columbia River Disposal Site, Oregon.	Figure 9

^{*}Based on Table C-IA "Station Data for Smith-McIntyre Grab Samples" from Appendix C

SEDIMENT QUALITY PARAMETERS:

In order to adequately assess the areas of consideration, seven sediment studies were performed over 17 years and in the various locations offshore of the Columbia River and MCR ODMDS. These sediment studies provided information that can be used to establish the baseline conditions for the Deep Water Site. The sediment quality analytical data covers nine general categories:

- 1. Physical Analyses
- 2. Metals
- 3. Phenols
- 4. Pesticides and Insecticides
- 5. Low Polynuclear Aromatic hydrocarbons
- 6. High Polynuclear Aromatic hydrocarbons
- 7. Chlorinated hydrocarbons
- 8. Miscellaneous extractables
- 9. Phthalates

The sediment quality analytical data is summarized in nine tables (Tables 2 through 10). Screening levels (SL) and bioaccumulation triggers (BT) as established in the 1998 DMEF (USACE/USEPA/WDNR/WDOE, 1998) are provided in the tables for references. The nine general categories that cover ODMDS baseline sediment quality analytical data will be discussed below.

PHYSICAL BASELINE:

Physical Analyses:

There is a considerable amount of sediment physical analyses at the Deep Water Site as Table 2 shows. All seven studies have physical analyses of the sediments, which assist in establishing baseline conditions for the site. The physical analyses are addressed in two main categories: The September 1, 2000 data and samples close to each other.

1. September 1, 2000 Data:

The September 1, 2000 sediment physical analyses at the Deep Water Site shows a mean grain size between 0.106 and 0.126 mm, with an average of 0.120 mm. The median grain size ranges from 0.14 to 0.31mm, with an average median grain size of 0.185 mm. This is larger than the estimated 0.15 mm median grain size for in native situ materials at existing ODMDSs described in the Appendix H, Integrated Feasibility Report of Channel Improvements and Environmental Impact Statement (USACE, 8/99).

The September 1, 2000 sample mean and median grain sizes vary from the other six studies' average mean and median grain sizes. The other six studies' shows a mean grain size between 0.094 and 0.233 mm, with an average mean grain size of 0.16 mm. This shows a wider distribution of grain size and a larger mean grain size than the 0.120 mm associated with the September 1, 2000 samples. Figure 11 shows the relationship of the

mean grain size to depth for five studies. As this graphic shows, there is a strong correlation between the mean grain size and the depth. Based on the graphic mean grain size, it becomes smaller with the greater depths. All five studies showed the same trend. The smaller grain size seen in the September 1, 2000 samples reflect an increase in percent fines with greater sample depths. Figure 12 shows the relationship of the median grain size to depth for five studies and it also shows the same trend of smaller grain size increases with depth. Figure 10 shows the relationship between the sample depth and the percent fines for five studies. As this graph shows, there is a strong correlation between sample depth and percent fines. Figure 10 also shows that at about 225 ft, the percent fines significantly increase with the greater depth.

The data on the Deep Water Site shows the site to have fine to medium marine sand, with a moderate percent of silts and clays, varying from station to station, as shown in Table 2. The percent fines increased with the increased distance from shore and depth, as shown on Figure 10. This is understandable since wave action exerts a decreasing influence from shore to 250 ft, depending on the median grain size and extent of the storm. According to Appendix H, Integrated Feasibility Report of Channel Improvements and Environmental Impact Statement (USACE, 8/99 pg 42), the extreme seaward limit for wave-induced sediment motion with a median sediment grain size of 0.15 mm is 250 ft and 200 ft for 0.25 mm grain size. At depths less than 59 ft, the wave current action can transport sediments easily. Wave actions working with ocean currents can wash the sand; suspend fines, carry them away and deposit them in places with calmer, deeper waters.

Previous studies of document these conclusions. The Continental Shelf Study the USGS performed in 1997 found that the amount of silt, clay and very fine sand increased as the distance from shore increased. The report states "The sediment samples, by contrast, show a progressive offshore fining of the surface sediments. On the lower beach face, surface sediments are primarily fine sand. On the inner shelf, the very fine sand fraction increases from 45% in 59 ft to 62% in 58 water depth." (Twichell, D., 2000). This is logical since the beach receives constant wave action, causing fines to go into suspension and carried them toward sea. Once the fines reach the more tranquil water offshore, the fines fall out of suspension and are deposited in various locations. This accounts for areas of progressive higher percent fines from shore, which is documented in Appendix H, Integrated Feasibility Report of Channel Improvements and Environmental Impact Statement (USACE, 8/99 pg H-58, Figure 17), which is included as Figure 13 of this report. As Figure 13 shows, the percent fines increase with distance from shore and from southern to northern direction.

2. Comparison of Sediment Characteristics Over Time:

There are three sets of samples that provide a comparison of sediment characteristics at one location over time. They were collected between 1992 and 1997 and within 800 ft of each other:

- A. Sample 40 take on 7/92 shown on Figure 7 and 35 taken on 10/95 and 6/96 shown on Figure 5.
- B. Sample 41 taken on 7/92 shown on Figure 7 and samples 17/56 taken in 1974-1975 shown on Figure 9.

C. Sample 68 taken on 9/97 shown on Figure 4 and sample 47 taken in 1974 shown on Figure 9.

A. Sample 40 and 35:

Sample 40 collected in July 1992 as part of the Reconnaissance Level Benthic Infaunal, Sediment, and Fish Study offshore of the Columbia River (Siipola, M., 1992) is within 710 ft of sample 35 collected in October 1995 and again in June 1996 as part of Benthic infauna and Sediment Characteristics offshore from the Columbia River, Oct/Nov. 1995 and June 1996 (Hinton, S, A., 1998). These three samples were taken at about the same depth (255 to 249 respectively) and have very similar physical characteristics: 28 to 32% very fine sand with 16 to 18 % fines. The sand gradation is also very similar, even though there were several years between the samplings. These facts suggest that the sediment in the area is fairly stable and not subject to significant change.

B. Samples 41 and 17/56:

Sample 41 collected in July 1992 as part of the Reconnaissance Level Benthic Infaunal, Sediment, and Fish Study offshore of the Columbia River (Siipola, M., 1992) is within 110 ft of samples 17 and 56, which were sampled during the 1974- 1976 Aquatic Disposal Field Investigations of the Columbia River Disposal Site study. Sample 41 had a 0.16 mm median grain size and a 0.15 mean grain size. As shown on Figure 11, a 0.15 mean grain size is approximately the average at 200 ft. The mean grain size was not reported for samples 17 and 56.

Sample 41 had a 9.1 percent fines, which is slightly higher than the average sample at 200 ft. As shown on Figure 10, percent fines range between 3 and 10 percent, with an average at approximately 6 percent. Sample 17 had 1 percent fines and sample 56 had 10 and 4 percent fines. Although the percent fines for samples 17 and 56 vary from each other and sample 41, the overall average for this location is approximately 5 percent fines, which is close to the average percent fines at 200 ft. In a general sense, these results are in agreement with the trends shown on Figure 10.

C. Samples 68 and 47:

Sample 68 collected in September 1997 as part of the Continental Shelf Study the USGS (Twichell, D, A., 2000) is within 800 ft of sample 47 collected during the 1974-1976 Aquatic Disposal Field Investigations of the Columbia River Disposal Site study. There is a 59 ft difference between the depth of sample 68 (239ft) and sample 47 (298 ft). Although this may seem like a minor difference in depth, according to Figure 10, its influence would be significant. At 239 ft, Figure 10 shows the percent fines could vary from 4 to 14 percent and at 295 ft, percent fines could vary from 20 to 37 percent. All lab results from sample 68 and 47 are close to the range that Figure 10 predicts. Sample 68 had 16.4 percent fines, which is close to the predicted range of 4 to 14 percent at 239 feet. Sample 47 had 21 and 47 percent fines, which is close to the range of 20 and 37 % at 295 ft.

SEPTEMBER 1, 2000 CHEMICAL BASELINE:

- 1. Elemental Metals: Concentrations of arsenic, cadmium, copper, lead, nickel, zinc and silver were detected in all ten September 1, 2000 samples. Mercury was detected in only sample C110 at a concentration of 0.038 ppm. As mentioned previous, of all the September 2000 samples, C133 had the highest detected arsenic (7.2 ppm) and the highest nickel (25ppm). Of all the September 2000 samples, C110 had the highest detected copper (15 ppm), lead (8.0 ppm) mercury (0.038) and cadmium (0.89 ppm). Although none of these concentrations are considered high, it is significant that these two samples have the highest concentrations of all available samples collected in the vicinity of the Deep Water Site. Both are among the deepest samples collected during the September 1, 2000 study. The northwest corner of the Deep Water Site which samples C133 and C110 represent has finer sediment.
- 2. Phenols: Phenols analyses were performed on the Deep Water Site samples and the results are shown on Table 4. Sample C97 showed a concentration of 20 ppb of phenol and 12 ppb of 4-methylphenol. Sample C133 showed a concentration of 140 ppb of phenol and 37 ppb of 4-methylphenol. Sample C110 showed a concentration of 6.2 ppb of 4-methylphenol. Samples C97, C133 and C110 are located in the deepest area of the Deep Water Site. Phenols occur naturally in bark and are associated with decaying vegetation, log rafting and forest product wastes. When these materials degrade, they commonly become part of the fines found in rivers and harbors. From this perspective, rivers and harbors typically have more of these materials than the ocean. But with the higher percent fines, phenols could appear as seen on Table C-4. Phenols are highly soluble in water and in high concentrations are bactericidal, but in lower concentrations may be rapidly degraded by bacteria.
- 3. Pesticides and PCBs: Pesticides and PCBs analyses were performed on Deep Water Site. As shown on Table 5, neither pesticides nor PCBs were detected.
- 4. Low Polynuclear Aromatic hydrocarbons(LPAH): A concentration of 7.0 ppb of phenanthrene was detected in sample C133 as shown on Table 6. This is the only LPAH detected and sample C133 was the only sample with a concentration above the 0.9 ppb detection limit. Sample C133 was collected at a depth of 295 ft. These results agree with the 1989-1992 Tongue Point (Siipola, M.1993) samples, which had no LPAHs detected.
- 5. High Polynuclear Aromatic hydrocarbons(HPAH): Sample C133 had concentrations of fluoranthene (9.8 ppb), pyrene (11 ppb), benz(a) anthracene (3.8 ppb), chrysene (3.2 ppb), benzo(a) pyrene (5.2 ppb) and benzo(g,h,I) perylene (4.3 ppb). It had the most detected LPAHs of all the September 2000 samples, with C100 the second most as shown on Table 7. Sample C100 had concentrations of fluoranthene (6.5 ppb), pyrene (8.1 ppb), benz(a) anthracene (4.3 ppb), benzofluoranthenes (b+k) (6.2 ppb), and benzo(a) pyrene (3.8 ppb). Sample C110 had a 3.5 ppb concentration of pyrene. All of these samples were taken at depths between 219 and 295 ft.

- 6. Chlorinated Hydrocarbons: As shown on Table 8, none were detected.
- 7. Miscellaneous Extractables: As shown on Table 9, none were detected.
- 8. Phthalate Compounds: All samples had concentrations of at least one phthalate compound. Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was detected in all ten samples, with concentrations varying from 27 ppb to 64 ppb are shown on Table 10. Sound Analytical Labs flagged these results with the B1 qualifier, which means, "This analyte was detected in the associated method blank. The analyte concentration was determined not to be significantly higher than the associated method blank (less than ten times the concentration reported in the blank)." The same qualifier flagged the Di-nbutyl phthalate concentrations, which ranged between 18 to 27 ppb on seven samples. The Di-nbutyl phthalate concentrations were also flagged with the J qualifier, which means, "The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified, but the associated numerical value is an estimated quantity." Since the Di-nbutyl phthalate and Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate concentrations are estimated and/or qualified, a clear conclusion can not be drawn from these results. These are common laboratory contaminates.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- 1. Hinton, S, A., 1998. Benthic Infauna and Sediment Characteristics Offshore From the Columbia River, October/November 1995 and June 1996. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, Portland, Oregon and U.S. National Marine Fisheries Services
- 2. Hinton, S, A. and R.L. Emmett, 1996. Benthic Infauna and Sediment Characteristics Offshore From the Columbia River, August 1994. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, Portland, Oregon and U.S. National Marine Fisheries Services
- 3. Holton, R, N. Cutshall, L. Gordon, and L. Small, 1978. Aquatic Disposal Field Investigations Columbia River Disposal Site, Oregon. U.S. Army Engineers, Dredged Material Research Program, Waterways Experiment Station.
- 4. Siipola, M, 1992. Reconnaissance Level Benthic Infaunal, Sediment and Fish Study Offshore from the Columbia River, July 1992. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, Portland, Oregon and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10.
- 5. Siipola, M, R. Emmett and S. Hinton, 1993. Tongue Point Monitoring Program 1989 1992, September 1993. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. National Marine Fisheries Services
- Twichell, D, A. VeeAnn, K. Parolski, 2000. Sidescan-sonar Imagery, Surface Sediment Samples, and Surficial Geologic Interpretation of the Southwestern Washington Inner Continental Shelf Based on Data Collected During Corliss Cruises 97007 and 98014. US Geological Survey and Washington Department of Ecology
- 7. USACE, 7/93. Mouth of the Columbia River sampling during July 1993 and August 1994, no formal report, information is from raw data file. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, Portland, Oregon Aug. 1994". U.S. Army
- 8. USACE, 10/95. Mouth of the Columbia River sampling during October-November, 1995, no formal report, information is from raw data file. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, Portland, Oregon
- 9. USACE, 6/96. Mouth of the Columbia River sampling during October-November, 1995, no formal report, information is from raw data file. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, Portland, Oregon.
- 10. USACE, 8/99. Appendix H, Volume I: Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Sites Main Report and Technical Exhibits Integrated Feasibility Report for Channel Improvements and Environmental Impact Statement Columbia and Lower Willamette River Federal Navigation Channel. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, Portland, Oregon
- 11. USACE, 9/00. Mouth of the Columbia River sampling during September 2000, no formal report, and information is from raw data file. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, Portland, Oregon
- 12. USACE/USEPA/WDNR/WDOE, 1998. Dredged Material Evaluation Framework, Corp of Engineers, Portland District, Portland, Oregon

TABLE 2 MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE PHYSICAL ANALYSES

Location	Sample	Date	Grai	n Size		Grain Size D	istribution	-			
Location	Sample	Date	Mean	Median	Sand	Vf Sand	Silt	Clay	TVS	тос	Depth
i			mm	mm	% finer	% Fines	% finer	%	%	10C %	(ft)
İ			******	111111	(passes 60 s.)	(passes 120 s.)	(passes 230 s.)	70	/6	/ 0	(11)
BASELINE (Deep Water Site)					(passes oo s.)	(passes tas s.)	(passes as a s.)				
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C89	9/1/2000	0.12	0.18	96.24	13.17	2.56	1.66	1.10	1.40	183
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C97	9/1/2000	0.12	0.17	94.52	19.05	9.57	4.22	2.10	4.90	260
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C98	9/1/2000	0.13	0.18	94.35	16.18	6.41	2.31	0.67	2.20	245
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C99	9/1/2000	0.12	0.18	95.89	16.16	4.03	1.51	1.36	2.20	233
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C100	9/1/2000	0.12	0.17	93.93	15.31	5.23	2.97	0.82	2.70	219
COE Dans Water Site Samuelina	0103	0/1/2000	0.12	0.10	06.20	12.02	2.41	1.60	1 10	1.00	400
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C102	9/1/2000	0.12 0.11	0.19 0.17	96.29 92.93	13.93	3.41	1.62	1.19	1.90	186
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C110	9/1/2000	0.11	0.17	92.93	27.09	16.14	5.25	2.71 3.05	6.80 6.40	280
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C133 C134	9/1/2000 9/1/2000	0.11	0.14	93.93	38.43 26.09	18.21	5.12	2.43	3.80	295 282
COE Deep Water Site Sampling COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C134 C136	9/1/2000	0.12	0.17	96.16	26.09 19.47	12.3 5.79	3.22 3.22	1.70	2.70	262 250
COL Deep Water Site Sampling	C130	21112000				17.41	J.17	3.44	,0	, •	-50
SW WA Sidescan-Sonar Study	46	9/1/1997	0.13	0.15	99.04	27.97	8.43	1.35			230
SW WA Sidescan-Sonar Study	67	9/1/1997	0.21	0.21	67.79	4.79	1.315	0.08			151
SW WA Sidescan-Sonar Study	68	9/1/1997	0.11	0.15	96.98	26.76	16.42	3.72			239
NATES - Denth in Information to	22	6/1/1006	0.15	0.16	00.70	22.40	10.20	2.00	1.00		400
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	32 33	6/1/1996 6/1/1996	0.15 0.13	0.16 0.15	98.70 98.20	23.40 31.60	10.20 21.70	3.00 8.10	1.00 1.00		180 200
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	33 34	6/1/1996	0.15	0.15	97.00	23.00	11.20	5.50	1.00		200
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	35	6/1/1996	0.13	0.16	98.60	31.60	17.90	7.60	1.90		249
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	36	6/1/1996	0.13	0.13	98.00	50.80	30.90	7.60 7.60	2.60		294
Nivir 3 3 Benune mauna Study	30	0/1/1990	0.11	0.12	70.00	30.80	30.90	7.00	2.00		254
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	32	10/1/1995	0.16	0.16	98.90	22.80	9.50	2.90	1.30		180
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	33	10/1/1995	0.16	0.16	98.30	23.40	8.90	3.00	1.50		200
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	34	10/1/1995	0.15	0.16	97.80	24.00	9.40	4.10	1.70		225
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	35	10/1/1995	0.14	0.15	98.00	28.00	15.70	4.10	1.60		249
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	36	10/1/1995	0.09	0.09	96.90	65.80	33.70	9.80	3.70		294
NINGER Dand in Inc. 8 Co. 1 Can dec	52	0/1/1004	0.14	0.15	00.00	20.20	15.50	0.00	0.40		400
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	52	8/1/1994	0.14 0.15	0.15	98.00	30.30	15.50	0.00			190
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	55 56	8/1/1994 8/1/1994	0.15	0.16 0.16	98.30 98.50	25.10 25.70	8.30 6.60	0.00 3.10	1.20 0.10		217 161
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	58	8/1/1994	0.16	0.16	98.60	22.40	7.40	3.10	1.30		220
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	59	8/1/1994	0.16	0.16	99.90	24.90	3.80	1.80	0.60		175
Tanh 5.5 Denune IIII. & Sea. Study	J7	U111177 1	0.10	5.10	,,,,,	∠ ¬.70	5.00	1.00	0.00		
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	A4	8/1/1994	0.23	0.21	65.20	4.80	2.40	0.00	0.80		150
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	A7	8/1/1994	0.16	0.16	97.20	22.30	2.00	0.00	0.50		150
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	B2	8/1/1994	0.16	0.16	95.60	22.90	5.40	0.00	1.00		148
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	B6	8/1/1994	0.21	0.19	76.20	7.50	3.40	0.00	0.50		140
ND (Fight Densitie V C a C 1 C 1	50	7/20/1002	0.10	0.16	00.40	25.10	12.00	0.00	2 40		100
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	52 55	7/29/1993 7/29/1993	0.18	0.16	90.40	25.10	13.80 4.80	0.00 0.00	3.40		190
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study		7/29/1993 7/29/1993	0.17	0.17	97.60	16.20 17.10			1.20		217
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	56 58	7/29/1993 7/29/1993	0.16 0.17	0.16 0.17	98.10 96.90	17.10 15.50	2.30 4.10	0.00 0.00	1.10 1.50		161 220
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	59	7/29/1993	0.17	0.17	98.90	21.30	2.50	0.00	1.00		220 175
Tari 5 5 Deliane III. & Sea. Study		112711773	V.10	5.10	70.70	21,30	2.50	0,00	1.00		
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	A4	7/29/1993	0.20	0.19	81.00	10.70	1.50	0.00	1.10		150
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	A7	7/29/1993	0.17	0.17	97.40	16.10	2.20	0.00	1.10		150
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	B2	7/29/1993	0.17	0.17	94.80	17.80	3.20	0.00	1.10		148
NMFS's Benthic Inf. & Sed. Study	B6	7/29/1993	0.19	0.19	81.00	11.10	2.10	0.00	0.80		140

TABLE 2- Continuation MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE PHYSICAL ANALYSES

Location	Sample	Date	Grain	n Size	G	rain Size D	istribution				<u> </u>
	=		Mean	Median	Sand %	Vf Sand	Silt %	Clay	TVS	TOC	Depth
			mm	mm	finer	% Fines	finer	%	%	%	(ft)
					(passes s.60)	(passes s.120)	(passes s.230)				()
BASELINE (Deep Water Site)									ì		
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	Al	7/1/1992	0.16	0.16	98.20	23.50	8.10	2.50	1.00	0.57	168
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	A4	7/1/1992	0.16	0.16	97.90	17.50	1.30	0.00	1.00	0.17	162
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	A 7	7/1/1992	0.16	0.15	96.70	30.70	0.10	0.00	1.00	1.20	156
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B2	7/1/1992	0.17	0.16	95.20	18.70	1.60	0.00	0.70	0.17	153
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B 3	7/1/1992	0.14	0.14	97.50	41.00	0.90	0.00	0.60	0.11	150
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B5	7/1/1992	0.16	0.16	97.60	20.40	1.00	0.00	0.80	0.13	150
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B6	7/1/1992	0.16	0.16	97.80	23.10	0.90	0.00	0.40	0.10	147
			1								
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	40	7/27/1992	0.14	0.15	98.70	30.10	15.60	5.30	0.71	2.2	255
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	41	7/27/1992	0.15	0.16	98.80	24.60	9.10	3.60	1.50	0.64	202
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	42	7/27/1992	0.18	0.17	86.90	18.00	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.06	85
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	44	7/27/1992	0.14	0.13	98.60	44.50	7.40	3.30	1.30	0.27	220
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	45	7/27/1992	0.16	0.16	98.70	24.30	0.50	0.00	0.70	0.2	159
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	46	7/27/1992	0.14	0.13	98.20	43.50	0.40	0.00	0.60	0.09	104
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	A1	7/9/1991	0.17	0.17	95.60	16.40	2.20	0.00	0.90	1 20	160
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	A4	7/9/1991	0.17	0.17	97.50	38.80	2.20	0.00		1.30	168
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	A4 A7	7/9/1991	0.15	0.14	98.10	38.80 19.50	0.70	0.00	1.00	0.95	162
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B2	7/9/1991	0.16	0.16	92.50	37.60	0.30 2.00	0.00	0.90	1.20	156
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B2 B3	7/9/1991	0.13	0.14	92.30 96.70			0.00	0.90	1.00	153
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B5	7/9/1991	0.14	0.15	96.70 95.60	44.10 31.70	0.90 0.50	0.00	0.80 0.70	0.94 1.10	150
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B6	7/9/1991	0.16	0.13	96.80	21.70	1.20	0.00	0.70	1.10	150 147
Tongue I I - ODIVIDS Site I	В	113/1331	0.10	0.10	70.00	21.70	1.20	0.00	0.00	1.50	147
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	Al	6/27/1990	0.16	0.16	97.90	17.50	0.90	0.00	1.00		168
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	A4	6/27/1990	0.16	0.16	97.40	26.80	2.50	0.00	1.00	0.16	162
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	A7	6/27/1990	0.16	0.16	97.80	24.60	0.40	0.00	0.80		156
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B2	6/27/1990	0.17	0.16	91.60	24.70	1.30	0.00	0.70	0.06	153
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	В3	6/27/1990	0.16	0.16	97.70	25.20	0.60	0.00	0.80		150
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B5	6/27/1990	0.15	0.15	97.20	33.00	0.60	0.00	0.80		150
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	В6	6/27/1990	0.15	0.15	97.80	34.70	0.40	0.00	0.90	0.04	147
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	Al	3/1/1990	0.16	0.16	97.40	23.40	1.70	0.00	0.90		168
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	A4	3/1/1990	0.16	0.16	98.00	18.30	0.60	0.00	0.70	0.07	162
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	A7	3/1/1990	0.16	0.16	96.70	20.80	0.60	0.00	0.80		156
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B2	3/1/1990		0.11	97.50	54.30	26.00	0.00	1.90	0.29	153
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B3	3/1/1990	0.17	0.17	95.90	15.80	0.30	0.00	0.60		150
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B5	3/1/1990	0.16	0.16	97.80	28.40	3.10	0.00	1.10		150
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	В6	3/1/1990	0.16	0.16	98.60	23.70	0.60	0.00	0.70	0.07	147
Toward Dr. ODS MOR O'S T		7/10/2000	0.17	, , , l	00.22	22.55	0.40			1	
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	A7	7/10/1989	0.16	0.16	98.30	22.50	0.40	0.00	0.80		156
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B2	7/10/1989	0.16	0.16	98.10	25.00	1.20	0.00	0.60	0.06	153
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B3	7/10/1989	0.16	0.15	98.40	27.10	0.80	0.00	0.60		150
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B5	7/10/1989	0.15	0.14	97.90	40.30	0.70	0.00	0.60	0.00	150
Tongue Pt - ODMDS Site F	B6	7/10/1989	0.15	0.14	98.10	36.10	0.50	0.00	0.60	0.08	147

TABLE 2-Continuation MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE PHYSICAL ANALYSES

BASELINE (Deep Water Site)	•	Date	Mean	n Size Median	Sand	Grain Size D Vf Sand					
,						V I Saliu	Silt	Clay	TVS	TOC	Depth
,			mm	mm	% finer	% Fines	% finer	%	%	%	(ft)
,					(passes 60 s.)	(passes 120 s.)	(passes 230 s.)	, 0	/*	70	(11)
						· · ·		-			
■ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·											
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	12	12/8/1974			99.00	41.00	2.00	1.00			115
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	12	12/11/1975			99.00	40.00	2.00	1.00			115
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	13	9/12/1975			98.00	40.00	1.00	1.00			167
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	13	12/11/1975			97.00	38.00	1.00	1.00			167
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	14	9/12/1975			99.00	42.00	2.00	1.00			230
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	14	10/1/1975			99.00	42.00	2.00	1.00			230
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	15	9/12/1975			99.00	48.00	1.00	0.00			266
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	15	10/1/1975			99.00	43.00	2.00	1.00			266
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	15	12/11/1975			98.00	40.00	2.00	1.00			266
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	16	12/1/1974			99.00	43.00	2.00	1.00			252
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	16	9/12/1975			99.00	45.00	2.00	1.00			252
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	16	10/1/1975			99.00	46.00	2.00	1.00			252
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	17	12/8/1974			99.00	42.00	1.00	1.00			202
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	17	12/0/19/4			94.00	26.00		1.00			203
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	18	12/11/19/3			94.00 97.00	26.00 35.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00			203
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	18	12/12/1974			99.00	35.00	2.00				131
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	10	12/12/17/7			99.00	33.00	2.00	1.00			131
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	18	7/8/1975			99.00	44.00	2.00	1.00			131
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	18	12/11/1975			96.00	32.00	1.00	1.00			131
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	19	12/8/1974			98.00	29.00	1.00	1.00			85
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	19	7/8/1975			97.00	29.00	2.00	2.00			85
			******					2.00			
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	47	9/28/1974			96.00	53.00	46.00	15.00			298
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	47	11/1/1974		[88.00	40.00	21.00	4.00			298
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	54	9/28/1974			97.00	75.00	58.00	16.00			282
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	54	11/1/1974			99.00	92.00	59.00	6.00			282
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	54	8/1/1975			98.00	96.00	81.00	12.00			282
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	55	1/25/1975			99.00	65.00	13.00	1.00			252
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	55	4/19/1975			99.00	75.00	26.00	2.00			252
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	55	7/23/1975			100.00	85.00	32.00	22.00			252
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	55	9/12/1975			100.00	97.00	79.00	13.00			252
A mostic Diseased Field Importing (5 (12/9/1074			00.00	7 0.00	10.00	1.00		J	202
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	56 56	12/8/1974			99.00	70.00	10.00	1.00			203
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation	56 56	1/25/1975 12/11/1975			96.00	57.00 50.00	4.00	1.00			203
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	56 69	9/28/1974			96.00	50.00	3.00	1.00			203
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation. Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	69	9/28/1974 1/25/1975			100.00 100.00	74.00	14.00 28.00	1.00 1.00			223 223
Aquatic Disposai Field Investigation.	UZ	1/23/19/3			100.00	88.00	28.00	1,00		 -	223
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	69	4/19/1975			100.00	80.00	18.00	1.00			223
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	69	7/23/1975			100.00	82.00	15.00	1.00			223
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	69	9/12/1975			100.00	83.00	26.00	4.00			223
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	70	9/28/1974			100.00	76.00	13.00	1.00			167
Aquatic Disposal Field Investigation.	70	1/25/1975			100.00	69.00	11.00	1.00			167

TABLE 3
MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE
TOTAL METALS ANALYSES OF SEDIMENTS in ppm

Location	Sample	Date	Arsenic	Cadmium	Chromium	Copper	Lead	Mercury	Nickel	Zinc	Silver
BASELINE (Deep Water Site)			***					,			211101
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C89	9/1/2000	3.90	0.39		7.70	4.30	< 0.02	14.00	44.00	0.07
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C97	9/1/2000	4.70	0.69		10.00	5.40	< 0.02	14.00	45.00	0.1
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C98	9/1/2000	4.70	0.52		8.30	4.70	< 0.02	15.00	45.00	0.081
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C99	9/1/2000	5.00	0.43		7.70	4.30	< 0.02	15.00	42.00	0.067
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C100	9/1/2000	5.60	0.38		9.30	5.10	< 0.02	16.00	48.00	0.098
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C102	9/1/2000	3.90	0.40		8.00	4.10	< 0.02	14.00	40.00	0.065
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C110	9/1/2000	6.20	0.89		15.00	8.00	0.038	18.00	55.00	0.16
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C133	9/1/2000	7.20	0.85		13.00	7.60	< 0.02	25.00	57.00	0.12
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C134	9/1/2000	6.40	0.73		11.00	6.80	< 0.02	18.00	50.00	0.12
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C136	9/1/2000	5.40	0.54		8.90	5.50	< 0.02	17.00	45.00	0.081
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	40	7/1/1992	3.70	0.06	29.00	8.90	4.50	0.02	14.00	58.00	< 0.01
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	41	7/1/1992	2.10	0.04	30.00	5.10	4.00	0.015	13.00	54.00	< 0.01
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	42	7/1/1992	1.20	0.01	35.00	4.40	< 2.00	0.011	15.00	62.00	< 0.01
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	44	7/1/1992	2.20	0.02	32.00	2.90	4.00	< 0.013	15.00	47.00	0.01
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	45	7/1/1992	2 20	0.02	22.00	2.00		0.040			
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	46	7/1/1992	2.30 1.10	0.02 0.01	32.00	2.80	<2.0	<0.013	14.00	45.00	<0.01
Tongue Point - Site F	B2	########	5.40	< 0.050	84.00	5.70	<2.0	<0.009	18.00	120.00	<0.01
Tongue Point - Site F	B6	########	5.40 5.40	<0.030	27.00 25.00	6.30 6.30	5.00 3.70	0.04 <0.030	0.00 0.00	52.00 45.00	
Tongue Tome Dite 1	D0		5.10	-0.050	23.00	0.50	3.70	~0.030	0.00	4J.00	
Tongue Point - Site F	A4	3/1/1990	2.70	0.04	19.50	4.75	4.59	0.02	14.50	38.90	< 0.01
Tongue Point - Site F	B2	3/1/1990	4.20	0.02	18.50	10.70	4.83	0.02	14.00	50.80	0.01
Tongue Point - Site F	В6	3/1/1990	4.30	0.02	19.70	4.60	4.87	0.03	14.00	37.80	< 0.02
Tongue Point - Site F	B2	7/1/1992	3.00	< 0.050	18.00	7.00	4.00	<0.02	14.00	42.00	<0.01
Tongue Point - Site F	В6	7/1/1992	3.00	< 0.050	22.00	6.00	5.00	<0.02	15.00	43.00	<0.01
Screening Levels			57	5.1		390	450	0.41	140	410	
Bioaccum. Trigger			507.1					1.5	370		

TABLE 4
MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE
PHENOLS COMPOUNDS ANALYSES in ppb

Location	Sample	Date	Phenol	2-methylphenol	4-methylphenol	2,4-dimethylphenol	Pentachlorophenol
BASELINE (Deep Water Site)							
COED W. G. G. P.							
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C89	9/1/2000	<4.7	<1.9	<3.4	<3.3	<1.7
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C97	9/1/2000	20.00	<2.0	12.00	<3.5	<1.8
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C98	9/1/2000	< 5.0	<2.0	<3.6	<3.6	<1.8
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C99	9/1/2000	<4.7	<1.9	<3.4	<3.3	<1.7
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C100	9/1/2000	< 5.0	<2.0	<3.6	<3.5	<1.8
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C102	9/1/2000	<4.5	<1.8	<3.2	<3.2	<1.7
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C110	9/1/2000	<5.4	<2.2	6.20	<3.8	<2.0
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C133	9/1/2000	140.00	<2.2	37.00	<3.8	<1.9
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C134	9/1/2000	<4.7	<1.9	<3.4	<3.3	<1.7
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C136	9/1/2000	<4.7	<1.9	<3.4	<3.3	<1.7
Screening level			420	63	670	29	400
Bioacc. Trigger			876				504

TABLE 5
MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE
PESTICIDES AND PCBs ANALYSIS in ppb

Location	Sample	Date	Total	Aldrin	Alpha-	Dieldrin	DDD	DDE	DDT	Endosulfan	Endrin	Endrin	Heptachlor	Heptachlor	Lindane	Methoxychlor	Toxaphene	Total
			BHC		Chlordane	;				I, II & Sulfate		aldehyde		epoxide	g-BHC	.	-	PCB
BASELINE (Deep Water Site)																		
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C89	9/1/2000	<0.28	<0.12	<8.5	<0.38	<0.14	<0.17	<0.21	<0.36	<0.38	<0.45	<0.13	<0.22	<0.23	<1.0	<15	<8.3
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C97	9/1/2000	<0.33	< 0.15	<10	< 0.35	< 0.17	<0.20	<0.25	<0.43	< 0.45	< 0.53	<0.16	< 0.26	<0.27	<1.0	<17	<9.9
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C98	9/1/2000	< 0.31	<0.14	<9.5	< 0.33	< 0.16	< 0.19	<0.24	<0.40	< 0.42	<0.50	<0.15	<0.24	<0.26	<1.1	<16	<9.3
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C99	9/1/2000	<0.18	< 0.13	<9.2	< 0.32	< 0.15	< 0.19	<0.23	<0.39	< 0.41	<0.48	<0.15	< 0.24	<0.25	<1.1	<16	<8.7
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C100	9/1/2000	<0.19	<0.13	<9.3	< 0.33	<0.16	<0.19	<0.23	<0.40	<0.42	<0.49	<0.15	<0.24	<0.25	<1.1	<16	<9.1
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C102	9/1/2000	<0.29	.0.12										11111111				
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C102			< 0.13	<8.8	<0.31	<0.15	<0.18	<0.22	<0.37	< 0.39	< 0.47	< 0.14	< 0.23	<0.24	<1.1	<15	<8.6
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C110	9/1/2000	<0.33 <0.19	< 0.15	<10.0	<0.36	<0.17	<0.21	<0.25	<0.43	<0.46	< 0.54	<0.16	<0.26	<0.28	<1.2	<18	<15.0
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C133	9/1/2000	<0.19	<0.13	<9.4	<0.33	<0.16	< 0.19	<0.23	<0.40	<0.42	<0.49	<0.15	< 0.24	< 0.25	<1.1	<16	<9.1
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C134		<0.18	<0.13 <0.13	<9.1 <9.2	<0.32 <0.32	<0.15 <0.16	<0.18 <0.19	<0.23 <0.23	<0.39 <0.39	< 0.41	<0.48	< 0.14	< 0.23	< 0.25	<1.1	<16	<8.9
COL Beep Water Site Sampling	C130	9/1/2000	\0.19	\0.13	\9.Z	<0.32	<0.16	<0.19	<0.23	<0.39	< 0.41	<0.49	<0.15	<0.24	<0.25	<1.1	<16	<8.8
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	42	7/1/1992		< 0.53	< 0.53	<0.71	< 0.89	<0.71	<1.8				< 0.53		0.96			<8.8
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	44	7/1/1992		< 0.60	< 0.60	<0.80	<1.0	<0.80	<2.0				<0.60		0.64			<10
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	45	7/1/1992		<0.58	<0.58	<0.78	< 0.97	<0.78	<1.9				<0.58		1.4			<9.7
NMFS's Benthic Infauna Study	46	7/1/1992		< 0.53	<0.53	<0.70	<0.88	<0.70	<1.8				< 0.53		0.89			< 8.8
Tongue Point - Site F	В2	######################################		-1.0	-1.0	-0.0	-0.0									***************************************		
Tongue Point - Site F	B3	*********		<1.0	<1.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<1.0	<2.0		<1.0		<1.0	<4.0	<150	<20.0
Tongue Point - Site F	A4	3/1/1990		<1.0	<1.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<1.0	<2.0		<1.0		<1.0	<4.0	<150	<20.0
Tongue Point - Site F	B2	3/1/1990		<3.0 <3.0	<4.0 <4.0	<6.0 <6.0	<6.0 <6.0	<6.0 <6.0	<6.0	<3.0	<6.0		<3.0		<3.0	<12.0	<450.0	<60.0
Tongue Fourt - Site F	D2	3/1/1990		\3.0	\4.0	V0.0	<0.0	<0.0	<6.0	<3.0	<6.0		<3.0		<3.0	<12.0	<450.0	<60.0
Tongue Point - Site F	В6	3/1/1990		<3.0	<4.0	<6.0	<6.0	<6.0	<6.0	<3.0	<6.0		<3.0		<3.0	<12.0	<450.0	<60.0
Tongue Point - Site F	B2	7/1/1992		<2.0	<10	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0		<2.0		<2.0	<12.0 <4.0		
Tongue Point - Site F	В6	7/1/1992		<2.0	<10	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0		<2.0		<2.0 <2.0	<4.0 <4.0	<30.0 <30.0	<10.0 <10.0
Commission land															- ' ' '			
Screening level				10	10	10								10	10			130
Bioacc. Trigger				37	37	37								37				38

TABLE 6
MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE
LOW POLYNUCLEAR AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS ANALYSES in ppb

Location	Sample	Date	Naphthalene	Acenaphthylene	Acenaphthene	Fluorene	Phenanthrene	Anthracene	2- Methyl-naphthalene	Total
BASELINE (Deep Water Site)						****	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			LPAHs
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C89	9/1/2000	<2.5	<1.0	<0.91	<1.0	<0.85	<1.2	<1.8	ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C97	9/1/2000	<2.6	<1.1	< 0.94	<1.1	< 0.88	<1.3	<1.9	ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C98	9/1/2000	<2.7	<1.1	< 0.97	<1.1	< 0.9	<1.3	<2.0	ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C99	9/1/2000	<2.5	<1.0	< 0.90	<1.0	< 0.84	<1.2	<1.8	ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C100	9/1/2000	<2.7	<1.1	<0.98	<1.1	< 0.9	<1.3	<1.9	ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C102	9/1/2000	<2.4	<1.0	< 0.87	<1.0	< 0.81	<1.2	<1.8	ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C110	9/1/2000	<2.9	<1.2	<1.0	<1.2	< 0.97	<1.4	<2.2	ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C133	9/1/2000	<2.9	<1.2	<1.0	<1.2	7.0	<1.4	<2.2	7.0
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C134	9/1/2000	<2.5	<1.0	< 0.90	<1.0	< 0.84	<1.2	<1.9	ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C136	9/1/2000	<2.5	<1.0	<0.91	<1.0	< 0.85	<1.2	<1.8	ND
Tongue Point - Site F	B2	7/10/1989	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0		ND
Tongue Point - Site F	В3	7/10/1989	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0		ND
Town a Pair 4 City F		2/1/1000	.50.0		•••					
Tongue Point - Site F	A4	3/1/1990	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0		ND
Tongue Point - Site F	B2	3/1/1990	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0		ND
Tongue Point - Site F	B6	3/1/1990	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0		ND
Tongue Point - Site F	B2	7/1/1992	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	-20 0	-20.0	-20.0		N.D.
1			<20.0 <20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0		ND
Tongue Point - Site F	B6	7/1/1992	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0		ND
Screening level			2,100	560	500	540	1,500	960	670	5,200
Bioacc. Trigger			_,							

TABLE 7
MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE
HIGH POLYNUCLEAR AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS ANALYSES in ppb

Location	Sample	Date	Fluoranthene	Pyrene	benz(a) -	Chrysene	Benzofluor-	Benzo (a) -	Indeno (1,2,3-c,d)	Dibenz(a,h)	Benzo(g,h,i)	Total
BASELINE (Deep Water Site)					anthracene		anthenes (b+k)	pvrene	pyrene	anthracene	pervlene	НРНАН
DAGELINE (Deep Water Site)												
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C89	9/1/2000	< 0.82	< 0.73	< 0.82	<1.1	<0.86	<1.1	<0.96	<0.6	<0.39	NID
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C97	9/1/2000	< 0.85	< 0.76	< 0.85	<1.1	<0.76	<1.1	<1.0	<0.62	<0.4	ND ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C98	9/1/2000	<0.88	< 0.78	< 0.88	<1.1	<0.78	<1.1	<1.0	< 0.64	<0.41	ND ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C99	9/1/2000	< 0.82	< 0.73	< 0.82	<1.1	<0.73	<1.1	<0.96	<0.6	<0.39	ND ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C100	9/1/2000	6.5	8.1	4.3	<1.1	6.2	3.8	<1.0	<0.63	<0.41	28.9
										*		
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C102	9/1/2000	<0.79	< 0.70	<0.79	<1.0	< 0.70	<1.0	< 0.92	< 0.57	< 0.37	ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C110	9/1/2000	<0.94	3.5	<0.94	<1.2	< 0.84	<1.2	<1.1	< 0.69	< 0.44	3.5
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C133	9/1/2000	9.8	11	3.8	3.2	< 0.83	5.2	<1.1	< 0.68	4.3	37.3
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C134	9/1/2000	<0.81	< 0.72	< 0.81	<1.1	< 0.72	<1.1	< 0.95	< 0.59	< 0.38	ND
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C136	9/1/2000	<0.82	<0.73	<0.82	<1.1	<0.85	<1.1	<0.96	<0.6	< 0.36	ND
Tongue Point - Site F	В2	7/10/1989	-200	***								
Tongue Point - Site F			<30.0	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0	<50.0	<60.0	<130.0	<130.0	<130.0	ND
Tongue Point - Site F	В3	7/10/1989	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0	<30.0	<50.0	<60.0	<130.0	<130.0	<130.0	ND
Tongue Point - Site F	A4	2/1/1000	450.0									
•		3/1/1990	<150.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<150.0	<150.0	<200.0	<200.0	<200.0	ND
Tongue Point - Site F	B2	3/1/1990	<150.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<150.0	<150.0	<200.0	<200.0	<200.0	ND
Tongue Point - Site F	B6	3/1/1990	<150.0	<50.0	<50.0	<50.0	<150.0	<150.0	<200.0	<200.0	<200.0	ND
T. D. C. D.												
Tongue Point - Site F	B2	7/1/1992	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<40.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	ND
Tongue Point - Site F	В6	7/1/1992	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<40.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	<20.0	ND
			4 =00				<u></u>					
Screening level			1,700	2,600	1,300	1,400	3,200	1,600	600	230	670	12,000
Bioacc. Trigger			4,600					3,600				

TABLE 8

MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE

CHLORINATED HYDROCARBONS ANALYSES in ppb

Location	Sample	Date	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	1,4- Dichlorobenzene	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene	Hexachlorobenzene
							(HCB)
BASELINE (Deep Water Site)							
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C89	9/1/2000	<3.6	<3.0	<2.6	<1.7	<2.8
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C97	9/1/2000	<3.8	<3.1	<2.7	<1.8	<3.4
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C98	9/1/2000	<3.9	<3.2	<2.7	<1.8	<3.5
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C99	9/1/2000	<3.6	<3.0	<2.6	<1.7	<3.2
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C100	9/1/2000	<3.8	<3.2	<2.7	<1.8	<3.4
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C102	9/1/2000	<3.5	<2.9	<2.5	<1.6	<2.7
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C110	9/1/2000	<4.2	<3.5	<3.0	<2.0	<3.7
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C133	9/1/2000	<4.1	<3.4	<2.9	<1.9	<3.7
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C134	9/1/2000	<3.6	<3.0	<2.5	<1.7	<3.2
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C136	9/1/2000	<3.6	<3.0	<2.6	<2.5	<3.2
Screening level							
_			170	110	35	31	22
Bioacc. Trigger			1,241	120	37		168

TABLE 9
MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE
MISCELLANEOUS EXTRACTABLES ANALYSES in ppb


Location	Sample	Date	Benzyl alchohol	Benzoic Acid	Dibenzo furan	Hexachloro- ethane	Hexachloro- Butadiene	N-Nitrosodi- phenylamine
BASELINE (Deep Water Site)								
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C89	9/1/2000	<3.9	<1.4	<2.6	<3.2	<2.8	< 0.95
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C97	9/1/2000	<4.0	<1.5	<2.7	<4.0	<2.9	< 0.99
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C98	9/1/2000	<4.1	<1.5	<2.8	<4.1	<3.0	<1.0
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C99	9/1/2000	<3.9	<1.4	<2.6	<3.8	<2.8	< 0.95
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C100	9/1/2000	<4.1	<1.5	<2.7	<4.1	<2.9	<1.0
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C102	9/1/2000	<3.7	<1.4	<2.5	<3.1	<2.7	< 0.92
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C110	9/1/2000	<4.5	<1.6	<3.0	<4.4	<3.2	<1.1
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C133	9/1/2000	<4.4	<1.6	<2.9	<4.4	<3.1	<1.1
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C134	9/1/2000	<3.8	<1.4	<2.7	<3.8	<2.7	< 0.94
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C136	9/1/2000	<3.9	<1.4	<2.6	<3.9	<2.8	< 0.95
Screening level			57	650	540	1,400	29	28
Bioacc. Trigger					340	10,220	212	28 130


TABLE 10 MCR ODMDS DEEP WATER SITE PHTHALATES ANALYSES in ppb


Location	Sample	Date	Dimethyl	Diethyl	Di-n-butyl	Butyl Benzyl	bis(2-Ethylhexyl)	Di-n-octyl
			_phthalate	phthalate	phthalate	phthalate	phthalate	phthalate
BASELINE (Deep Water Site)								
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C89	9/1/2000	<4.0	<2.7	18-J B1	<1.9	31-B1	<3.1
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C97	9/1/2000	<4.2	<2.8	19-J B1	<2.0	27-B1	<3.2
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C98	9/1/2000	<4.3	<2.9	24-J B1	<2.0	37-B1	<3.3
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C99	9/1/2000	<4.0	<2.7	<16	<1.9	37-B1	<3.1
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C100	9/1/2000	<4.3	<2.9	23-J B1	<2.0	27-B1	<3.2
		•						
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C102	9/1/2000	<3.9	<2.6	23-J B1	5.9	64-B1	<2.9
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C110	9/1/2000	<4.6	<3.1	<18	<2.2	42-B1	<3.5
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C133	9/1/2000	<4.6	<3.1	23-J B1	<2.1	38-B1	<3.5
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C134	9/1/2000	<4.0	<2.7	<16	<1.9	39-B1	<3.0
COE Deep Water Site Sampling	C136	9/1/2000	<4.0	<2.7	27-B1	<1.9	31-B1	<3.1
Screening level Bioacc. Trigger			1,400 1,400	1,200 	5,100 10,220	970 	8,300 13,870	6,200


B1 = This analyte was detected in the associated method blank. The analyte concentration was determined not to be significantly higher than the associated method blank (less than ten times the concentration reported in the blank).


J = The analyte was analyzed for and positively identified, but the associated numerical value is an estimated quanity.




















Figure 10




Figure 11




Figure 12

